DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 147 TM 012 237

AUTHOR Pugh, Wesley C.
TITLE An Analysis of Multiple Indicators To Evaluate School Improvement Projects.
PUB DATE May 88
NOTE 38p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Eastern Evaluation Research Society (Villanova, PA, May 23, 1988).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Development; *Educational Environment; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Planning; Program Evaluation; *Program Improvement; *Public Schools; *School Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS Multidimensional Approach; *Philadelphia School District PA; *Replicating Success Project; School Climate Profile

ABSTRACT

Results of a comprehensive study of the school climate component in the School District of Philadelphia's school improvement project--the Replicating Success Project (RSP)--are reported. The RSP study, which was implemented in a large urban public school system, uses multiple indicators and a chart essay in reporting findings in order to present an evaluation that is useful to decision makers. The RSP focuses on school climate, using multiple indicators to assess school climate at the 20 RSP schools and six school-wide project sites. Data analysis consisted of both quantitative and qualitative indicators of school climate. Findings indicate that: (1) no definitive claims of improvement in the overall project can be determined after three years of program operation (1984-87); (2) staff perceived school climate improvements, although quantitative results are mixed; (3) the RSP should emphasize school-based leadership; (4) involvement of central office research/evaluation and curriculum staff should continue; (5) long-range administrative stability within the project is imperative; (6) school-wide project emphases should be expanded to other schools within the program; and (7) recognition and duplication of "pockets of excellence" are needed. (Author/TJH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED298147

AN ANALYSIS OF MULTIPLE INDICATORS TO EVALUATE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

WESLEY C. PUGH, Ph.D.
OFFICE OF RESEARCH & EVALUATION
POLICY RESEARCH UNIT
SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✔This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Wesley C. Pugh

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

(Paper presented at the Eastern Evaluation Research Society, Eleventh Annual Conference, Villanova University Villanova, Pennsylvania. May 23, 1988.)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TM012237

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract	i
Executive Summary	1
Introduction	3
Definition of School Climate Variables (Multiple Indicators)	5
The Findings: Research Questions, Trends and Data Tables	7
Research Question One: Have the absence rates for teachers in the Replicating Success (and Priority 1 Schoolwide Projects) program declined during the three year period (1984-1987) that the program has operated?	8
Research Question Two: Has overall staff attendance which includes para-professionals, and reading aides improved at Replicating Success and Priority 1 Schoolwide Project sites?	10
Research Question Three: Has there occurred an increase in teachers new to schools in the Replicating Success and Priority 1 Schoolwide Project sites?	11
Research Question Four: Have the student attendance rates improved at the Replicating Success and Priority 1 Schoolwide Project sites?	13
Research Question Five: Have the student suspension rates declined at the Replicating Success Project and Schoolwide Project sites?	15
Research Question Six: Are student withdrawals being reduced at the Replicating Success Project schools?	16
Research Question Seven: Has there been a reduction in the student turnover rates for Replicating Success and Schoolwide Project sites?	17
Research Question Eight: Are the chief administrators for the Replicating Success and Schoolwide Projects experienced, i.e., do they have extensive administrative experience as school principals?	19
Research Question Nine: Did student award assemblies, and other recognition of students' achievement occur at Replicating Success and Schoolwide Project sites?	21

Page

Research Question Ten: What is the perception of Replicating Success and Schoolwide Project school principals, central office personnel assigned to work at the schools, and School Improvement Council (SIC) chairpersons at the schools, on improvement(s) in the school climate?..... 21

Implications of Findings..... 22

Policy Recommendations..... 23

References..... 25

Appendix A: Absence Rates for Teachers and Para-Professionals..... 27

List of Tables

		Page
Table 1. -	Absence Rates For Teachers, Replicating Success Schools, 1985-1987.....	9
Table 2. -	Teachers New To School, Replicating Success Schools, 1985-1987.....	12
Table 3. -	April Student ADA Rates For Replicating Success Schools, 1985-1987.....	14
Table 4. -	Student Suspensions (In Percentages).....	15
Table 5. -	Student Withdrawals, Replicating Success Program, 1984-1985.....	16
Table 6. -	Student Turnover Rates (April Profiles), Replicating Success Schools, 1984-1987.....	18
Table 7. -	Principals' Length of Service, Replicating Success Schools, 1987.....	20

ABSTRACT

Paper Title: An Analysis of Multiple Indicators to Evaluate School Improvement Projects (Utilizing the Chart Essay Method)

School improvement projects have been established nationwide in urban public school systems as an innovative approach to addressing the needs of so-called underachievers. This paper is a comprehensive study of the school climate component in one such program known as the Replicating Success Project (RSP), which was implemented in a large urban public school system.

Two unique features of this paper are: (1) its approach to the evaluation of the project using "multiple indicators"; and (2) the use of a Chart Essay in reporting the findings, in order to present an evaluation that has utility to decisionmakers.

The Replicating Success Project (Priority One Initiative) which began in 1984 has consistently focused on school climate as a major component of the district's school improvement efforts. Multiple indicators were used to assess school climate at the 20 Replicating Success Project (RSP) schools and the six Schoolwide Project sites (in addition to five RSP schools which are also Schoolwide Projects).

The data analysis consisted of both quantitative and qualitative indicators of school climate. The findings suggest that while a worsening of school climate in the RSP is not a dominant feature, no definitive claims of improvement in the overall project can be determined from the data after three years of program operation.

The findings indicate that staff perceived school climate improvements occurring, while the quantitative data results are, at best, mixed for the three year period 1984-1987.

The implications of the findings contributed to the following policy considerations which emerged from the evaluation study:

(1) The RSP must continue to emphasize and develop school-based leadership;

(2) The involvement of central office-research/evaluation and curriculum staff, along with district office support needs to continue and possibly expand;

(3) Long range administrative stability within the project is imperative;

(4) Schoolwide Project emphases should be expanded to other schools within the program;

(5) Recognition and duplication of "pockets of excellence" need to occur.

In addition to the inferences that can be made from the evaluation about the district's school improvement program, the use of multiple indicators and the chart essay approach illustrate the potentially increased utility of program evaluations to policymakers.

Executive Summary

An analysis of school climate variables associated with the Replicating Success Project (RSP) and Priority 1 Schoolwide Projects indicates the following results:

Staff Attendance

- Over the three year period (1984-1987), the teacher absence rate for the 20 RSP schools declined by 0.2% in 1986, and increased by 0.5% in 1987.
- The six schools classified as Priority 1 Schoolwide Projects, and the five Replicating Success (RS) Schoolwide Project schools showed improved teacher attendance rates when compared with the other 15 RSP schools in 1986-87.
- Para-professionals and reading aides in the majority of the RSP schools had decreases in absence rates for school years 1984-1986, followed by increases in 1986-87.
- The six Priority 1 Schoolwide Project schools had a lower average number of absences for para-professionals and reading aides than the 20 RSP schools in 1986-87.
- The five RS Schoolwide Project schools had mixed results in the area of improved attendance for para-professionals and reading aides during the years 1984-87.

Teachers New To School

- In 15 of the 20 RSP schools an increase in the number of teachers new to a school occurred during the school years 1985-86 and 1986-87.
- Overall, for the 20 RSP schools, teachers new to schools increased 8.4% from 1985-86 to 1986-87.
- Teachers new to schools for the 11 Priority 1 Schoolwide Projects increased 13.7% during the years 1985-86 and 1986-87.

Student Attendance

- For school years 1984-85 and 1985-86, the student attendance rate decreased 0.56% for the 20 RSP schools.
- For school years 1985-86 and 1986-87, the student attendance rate decreased 1.86% for the 20 RSP schools.
- The six Priority 1 Schoolwide Project schools, and the five RS Schoolwide Project schools had higher student attendance rates than the other 15 RSP schools.

Student Suspension

- Both RSP and Priority 1 Schoolwide Project schools had student suspension rates which were higher than the School District rates at comparable grade levels.

Student Withdrawals

- The student withdrawal rate for the 20 RSP schools was slightly less than the School District's withdrawal rate for the school years 1984-85 and 1985-86.

Student Turnover

- In 12 of the 20 RSP schools a decrease in the student turnover rate occurred for the school years 1984-85 to 1985-86, and 1985-86 to 1986-87.

- The 11 Schoolwide Project schools showed an overall reduction in the student turnover rate for the school years 1985-86 to 1986-87.

Principals' Length of Service

- The majority of RSP school principals have at least five years of administrative experience at their assigned schools.

- The average number of years RSP principals have served as administrators in the School District is 10.7 years.

- The six principals in the Priority 1 Schoolwide Projects have an average of 1.7 years of experience at their assigned schools, and an average of 8.3 years of administrative experience in the District.

Students Awards Assemblies

- Program evaluators' documentation indicated that, at all 26 schools in the RS and Priority 1 Schoolwide Projects, students awards assemblies were consistently conducted.

Program Staff Perception

- At 23 of the 26 school sites, principals, central office staff, and School Improvement Council chairpersons assessed the school climate. The perception at 17 of the 23 schools was that the school climate had improved since the inception of the RSP.

Introduction

This is an evaluation of school climate in the School District of Philadelphia's school improvement program known as the Replicating Success Project (RSP). Multiple indicators were used to assess the school climate of the RSP schools. Twenty-six (26) schools comprise the primary cohort of the Priority 1/Replicating Success Program. These 26 schools consist of 20 original Replicating Success schools-including two junior high schools-and six other Schoolwide Projects, i.e., special Chapter I schools with at least 75% AFDC (pupils from families on public assistance). There are a total of 11 Schoolwide Projects, but five of these were Replicating Success sites prior to 1986-87 when Schoolwide Projects were implemented.

The School District of Philadelphia's Priority 1/Replicating Success Project, which began in 1984, is designed to assist selected low achieving schools in replicating the essential elements of successful schools: school climate conducive to learning; schoolwide emphasis on basic skills; a system of clear instructional objectives for monitoring and assessing students' performances; and, a principal who is a strong programmatic leader and who sets high standards, communicates high expectations, frequently observes classrooms, and creates incentives for learning. Another important component of the program is extensive administrative, teacher, and parent training to develop the necessary support infrastructure. All participating schools follow a standard model reflecting the above emphasis which includes: a School Improvement Council, parent scholars, use of the mandated District curriculum, and development of a positive self-image among students.

There will be several evaluative reports on Priority 1/Replicating Success, each focusing on a separate component. This study focused on the school climate component. According to the project's objective, "RSP schools will exhibit a school climate (consisting of multiple indicators) that reflects improved staff morale and an atmosphere more conducive to learning..."

The initial study of the project which focused on school climate indicated that participants in the Replicating Success Program perceived improvements occurring at the individual school sites (School District of Philadelphia Report No. 8606, Pugh, 1985).

A follow-up evaluation of the RSP, using multiple indicators to assess the school climate, found that the 20 RSP schools showed signs of improvement (School District of Philadelphia Report No. 8714, Pugh, 1986).

This year's study combined and expanded on the previous years' evaluations. The perceptions of school principals, central office staff assigned to the schools, and School Improvement Council chairpersons at

the schools were solicited, along with an analysis of an expanded set of school climate variables.

A variety of data sources was used to evaluate school climate at the RS and Schoolwide Project sites. The variables analyzed in this study are listed in the next section of this report entitled: Definition of School Climate Variables (Multiple Indicators).

This report presents a synopsis of the findings (Executive Summary), along with 10 research questions and trends based on an analysis of the data for the school years 1984-85, 1985-86, and 1986-87. Data tables accompany the research questions and trend analysis. Implications of the findings and policy recommendations are also presented.

In the evaluation of the multiple indicators of school climate,the analysis of the data suggested that there were no notable distinctions between Cohort I schools (three years in the project), and Cohort II schools (two years in the project). The discussion of the results is from an overall project perspective without consideration for individual schools' duration of involvement. When appropriate, the Schoolwide Project sites (five Replicating Success schools, and six schools which began in the Priority 1 program in 1986) were evaluated separately from the RSP schools. This was done to assess the potential impact of the additional focus associated with the 11 Schoolwide Project sites.

Definition of School Climate Variables (Multiple Indicators)

- Principal's length of service (as a principal in the system, and as the school's principal) - refers to the number of years a school's chief administrator has served in the school system, i.e., based on the principal's original appointment date up to 1987; and the number of years served at the project school up to 1987 (see Table 7).

- Replicating Success Project (RSP) - a program designed to assist selected low achieving schools in replicating the essential elements of successful schools (20 schools are involved; five are designated as Priority 1 Schoolwide Project sites).

- Priority I Schoolwide Projects - refers to schools with at least 75% of the students from low income families; Chapter I funds are matched by School District funds for non-eligible students, providing in this way a supplementary effort for the whole school. The overall emphasis is on prevention of student failure and coordination of programs characterized by: structures that increase the amount and quality of education; reduce teacher-pupil ratio; systems that ensure the integration of structures into an effective academic program, and on-going supplementary/remedial support for students (six schools plus five RSP schools make up the Schoolwide Projects' cohort of 11 schools).

- Staff Absence Rate - refers to the number of personal illness days used during a specified school year (September-June) by para-professionals, reading aides, and classroom teachers (see Appendix A).

- Student Average Daily Attendance (ADA) - the mean (average) number of students who attend school based on the total number of students on roll divided by the number who attended school during a specified time. The calculations are based on data for the month of April in a specified school year, and are consistent with averages derived from a full year analysis (10 months) of students' attendance rates (see Table 3).

- Student Suspension Rate - the percentage of the student population in a given school year who were issued "pink slips" which led to in-school or out-of-school suspension (temporary removal from the class) as a result of an infraction of school rules (see Table 4).

- Student Turnover Rate - refers to the number of students admitted and dismissed from a school, divided by the total number of students on roll for a given period to produce a percentage that represents the turnover rate, i.e., influx and migration of students in a given school. The evaluations are based on the month of April in a given school year. It should be noted that the turnover percentage (see Table 6) when multiplied by a factor of 10 (representing 10 months) provides a profile of the student turnover rate for an entire school year.

- Student Withdrawal Rate - the number and percentage of students in a school that left for any of the specified withdrawal codes-early graduate, dropout, and non-dropout categories. For this study, non-dropout withdrawals were used and refer to pupils leaving school for reasons other than graduate or dropout (see Table 5).

- Teacher Absence Rate - refers to the number of personal illness days used by teachers during a specified school year (September-June) (see Table 1).

- Teachers New to School - the number of new teachers, i.e., first time teaching in the school system, combined with the number of teachers new to a given school but who have teaching experience within the system. The sum of the new teachers (first time teaching) and teachers new to a school (previous teaching experience in the school system) when divided by the total number of teachers at the school equals the percent total teachers new to a school, i.e., the influx of teachers new to a given school in a specified school year (see Table 2).

  (Note Re: Data Tables-some percentages, in tenths, may be .1 to .2 plus or minus different when summed. The differences are negligible.)

The Findings: Research Questions, Trends and Data Tables

Research Question One: Have the absence rates for teachers in the Replicating Success (and Priority 1 Schoolwide Projects) program declined during the three year period (1984-1987) that the program has operated?

Trends

(Based on Table 1, attached)

- At the end of two years (1984-85; 1985-86), 10 of the 20 Replicating Success schools reduced staff absences.
- For the 20 RSP schools, staff absences were reduced by 0.2% between 1984-86.
- At the end of three years (1984-1987) a comparison between the school years 1985-1986 and 1986-1987 indicates that 10 of the RSP schools reduced staff absences. However, they were not the identical 10 schools that had reduced teacher absences in the previous year.
- Six schools went from increased absences in 1985-86 to reductions in 1986-1987.
- Six other schools went from reductions to increases in teacher absences between 1985-1986 and 1986-1987.
- Four of the 20 RSP schools showed consistent improvements in teacher absences, i.e., they reduced the teacher absence rate for two consecutive years from 1984-85 to 1985-86, and again in 1985-86 to 1986-87.
- Overall, for the school year 1986-1987, the 20 RSP schools had an increase in teacher absences of 0.5%, compared with a reduction of 0.2% for the years 1984-85 to 1985-86.

Schoolwide Projects

- Those schools identified as Priority 1 Schoolwide Projects (N=6) showed a lower staff absence rate than the 20 RSP schools for the year 1986-87.
- RS Schoolwide Projects (N=5) tended to have slightly improved teacher attendance rates than those RSP schools not classified as Schoolwide Projects.

Table 1.

ABSENCE RATES FOR TEACHERS
REPLICATING SUCCESS SCHOOLS, 1985-1987

School	1985 No. Emp.	1985 P.I.	1985 %PI	1986 No. Emp.	1986 P.I.	1986 %PI	1987 No. Emp.	1987 P.I.	1987 %PI	% Change* 85-86	% Change* 86-87
001	39	487.0	5.8	40	285.0	3.3	44	384.5	4.0	-2.5	+0.7
002	33	301.0	4.2	31	437.5	6.5	31	273.5	4.1	+2.3	-2.4
003	42	504.0	5.6	38	470.0	5.7	39	371.0	4.4	+0.1	-1.3
004	36	308.0	4.0	35	319.5	4.2	40	461.5	5.3	+0.2	+1.1
005	25	308.5	5.7	23	181.5	3.7	26	375.5	6.7	-2.0	+3.0
006 ‡‡	21	141.5	3.1	23	193.0	3.9	25	200.5	3.7	+0.8	-0.2
007	33	263.0	3.7	32	424.5	6.1	31	344.5	5.1	+2.4	-1.0
008 ‡‡	27	219.0	3.8	24	176.5	3.4	30	242.5	3.7	-0.4	+0.3
009	33	258.0	3.6	34	224.5	3.1	37	458.5	5.7	-0.5	+2.7
010	24	334.0	6.4	25	194.5	3.6	22	152.0	3.2	-2.8	-0.4
011 ‡‡	37	545.0	6.8	36	593.5	7.6	40	610.0	7.1	+0.8	-0.6
012 ‡‡	34	512.0	7.0	34	436.0	5.9	40	310.0	3.6	-1.1	-2.3
013	35	252.0	3.3	34	230.0	3.1	37	233.0	2.9	-0.2	-0.2
014	40	418.5	4.8	43	370.5	4.0	46	334.0	3.4	-0.8	-0.6
015 ‡‡	25	266.0	4.9	26	382.0	6.8	32	433.0	6.3	+1.9	-0.5
016	30	306.0	4.7	32	235.0	3.4	35	432.0	5.7	-1.3	+2.3
017	15	110.5	3.4	17	207.0	5.6	20	298.5	6.9	+2.2	+1.3
018	77	897.0	5.4	68	790.5	5.4	72	1056.5	6.8	0.0	+1.4
019	22	263.0	5.5	22	150.0	3.2	25	475.5	8.8	-2.3	+5.6
020	42	218.5	2.4	40	250.0	2.9	43	367.5	4.0	+0.5	+1.1
Total	670	6512.5	4.8	657	6551.0	4.6	715	7814.0	5.1	-0.2	+0.5

‡‡ INDICATES R.S.P. SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS (1986-1987)

PRIORITY 1 SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS
1987

School	No. Emp.	P.I.	%PI
021	37	200.5	2.5
022	23	185.5	3.7
023	33	204.5	2.9
024	18	297.5	7.7
025	25	167.0	3.1
026	35	236.5	3.1
Total	171	1291.5	3.5

Personnel Identification (PID) Codes:

P.I. - Total Personal Illness Days
*In the context of this table a minus sign (-), i.e., reduction in absences is a positive occurrence.

RSPTAB3 10/1/87 PC37 \rs

Research Question Two: Has overall staff attendance which includes para-professionals, and reading aides improved at RS and Priority 1 Schoolwide Project sites?

Trends

(Based on Appendix A)

- For the school years 1984-1985 and 1985-1986, the absence rate for para-professionals was reduced, i.e., less sick days were used, at eight of the 20 RSP schools.

- For the school years 1985-86 and 1986-87, the absence rate for para-professionals was reduced at seven of the 20 RSP schools.

- Overall, for the 20 RSP schools the absence rate for para-professionals was reduced between 1984-1985 and 1985-1986, but increased during school years 1985-86 and 1986-87.

- The above descriptive pattern for para-professionals applies to reading aides. The number of schools that showed reductions in the absence rate for reading aides, followed by increases in the subsequent year, is slightly higher than the figure for para-professionals.

Schoolwide Projects

- Those schools identified as Priority 1 Schoolwide Projects (N=6) had a lower average number of absences than the overall average of the 20 RSP schools in 1986-87.

- The RS Schoolwide Project schools (N=5) had mixed results, i.e., some of the schools had improvements while others did not have improvements between the years 1984-1987.

Research Question Three: Has there occurred an increase in teachers new to schools in the RS and Priority 1 Schoolwide Project sites?

Trends

(Based on Table 2, attached)

- In 15 of the 20 RSP schools, an increase in the number of teachers new to a school occurred between 1985-86 and 1986-87.

- The number of teachers new to a school for the 20 RSP schools increased 8.4% for the years 1985-86 and 1986-87.

Schoolwide Projects

- In those schools identified as Priority 1 Schoolwide Projects (N=6), all but one had increases in teachers new to the school for years 1985-86 and 1986-87.

- Overall, for the 11 Schoolwide Projects (including the five RSP schools), the number of teachers new to a school increased 13.7% compared to 8.4% for the twenty RSP schools.

  (It should be noted that teachers new to a school is not necessarily a negative factor. In all cases the influx of new teachers was due to increased pupil enrollments and/or attempts to reduce the class size. However, faculty instability is suggested by this occurrence.)

Table 2.

TEACHERS NEW TO SCHOOL
REPLICATING SUCCESS SCHOOLS, 1985-1987

School		TEACHERS BEGINNING 85-86	TEACHERS BEGINNING 86-87	NEW TO SCHOOL 85-86	NEW TO SCHOOL 86-87	TOTAL 85-86	TOTAL 86-87	% TOTAL TEACHERS NEW TO SCHOOL 85-86	% TOTAL TEACHERS NEW TO SCHOOL 86-87	% CHANGE 1985-87
001		2	1	2	5	46	45	8.7	13.3	4.6
002		3	3	2	4	34	35	14.7	20.0	5.3
003		2	1	2	3	37	39	10.8	10.3	-0.6
004		1	1	2	6	37	44	8.1	15.9	7.8
005		0	6	1	8	21	27	4.8	51.9	47.1
006	‡‡	0	1	2	4	23	26	8.7	19.2	10.5
007		3	0	4	4	33	35	21.2	11.4	-9.8
008	‡‡	1	2	1	10	25	34	8.0	35.3	27.3
009		0	1	1	7	32	44	3.1	18.2	15.1
010		2	2	2	4	24	25	16.7	24.0	7.3
011	‡‡	4	6	4	8	35	44	22.9	31.8	9.0
012	‡‡	2	5	3	11	36	40	13.9	40.0	26.1
013		1	1	0	2	35	36	2.9	8.3	5.5
014		1	4	6	4	44	49	15.9	16.3	0.4
015	‡‡	0	4	4	10	28	33	14.3	42.4	28.1
016		1	2	3	2	33	37	12.1	10.8	-1.3
017		0	2	3	2	18	20	18.8	20.0	1.3
018		6	3	4	6	74	78	13.5	11.5	-2.0
019		2	1	2	2	26	26	15.4	11.5	-3.8
020		2	4	4	8	39	47	15.4	25.5	10.1
Total (n=20)		33	50	52	110	678	764	12.5	20.9	8.4

‡‡ INDICATES R.S.F. SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS (1986-1987)

PRIORITY 1 SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS 1987
(n=6)

School	TEACHERS BEGINNING 85-86	TEACHERS BEGINNING 86-87	NEW TO SCHOOL 85-86	NEW TO SCHOOL 86-87	TOTAL 85-86	TOTAL 86-87	% TOTAL TEACHERS NEW TO SCHOOL 85-86	% TOTAL TEACHERS NEW TO SCHOOL 86-87	% CHANGE 1985-87
021	5	7	5	14	30	38	33.3	55.3	21.9
022	3	2	2	4	19	23	26.3	26.1	-0.2
023	2	2	2	6	31	38	12.9	26.3	13.4
024	0	1	1	3	19	19	5.3	21.1	15.8
025	1	3	1	7	20	24	10.0	41.7	31.7
026	1	2	4	2	33	36	15.2	11.1	-4.0
Total	12	17	15	38	152	178	17.8	30.9	13.1
Total (all Schoolwide Projects) (n=11)	19	35	29	81	299	355	12.3	27.6	15.3

RSPtea4 10/6/87 PC37 \rs

Research Question Four: Have the student attendance rates improved at the RS and Priority 1 Schoolwide Project sites?

Trends

(Based on Table 3, attached)

- In seven of the 20 RSP schools, student attendance improved for the school years 1984-85 and 1985-86.
- Overall, for the school years 1984-85 and 1985-86, student attendance dropped 0.56% for the 20 RSP schools.
- Three RSP schools out of 20 showed improvement in student attendance between the school years 1985-86 and 1986-87.
- Overall, for the school years 1985-86 and 1986-87, student attendance dropped 1.86% at the 20 RSP schools.

Schoolwide Projects

- Priority 1 Schoolwide Projects had higher student attendance rates in 1986-87 than the composite rate of the RSP.

Table 3.

APRIL STUDENT ADA RATES FOR REPLICATING SUCCESS SCHOOLS 1985-1987

School	April 1985			April 1986			April 1987			%ADA CHANGE *	
	ANR	ADA	%ADA	ANR	ADA	%ADA	ANR	ADA	%ADA	1985-86	1986-87
001	716	651	90.92	702	632	90.03	742	657	88.54	-0.89	-1.48
002	681	598	87.81	694	590	85.01	701	594	84.74	-2.80	-0.28
003	568	412	72.54	522	357	68.39	493	314	63.69	-4.14	-4.70
004	643	547	85.07	654	585	89.45	646	561	86.84	4.38	-2.61
005	506	467	92.29	353	310	87.82	407	359	88.21	-4.47	0.39
006 **	432	391	90.51	407	358	87.96	392	345	88.01	-2.55	0.05
007	439	391	89.07	434	384	88.48	371	325	87.60	-0.59	-0.88
008 **	600	535	89.17	579	520	89.81	639	538	84.19	0.64	-5.62
009	783	713	91.06	780	710	91.03	776	688	88.66	-0.03	-2.37
010	405	363	89.63	392	353	90.05	380	333	87.63	0.42	-2.42
011 **	780	692	88.72	793	691	87.14	784	654	83.42	-1.58	-3.72
012 **	779	693	88.96	782	689	88.11	754	653	86.60	-0.85	-1.50
013	610	523	85.74	586	509	86.86	558	480	86.02	1.12	-0.84
014	793	698	88.02	828	740	89.37	820	707	86.22	1.35	-3.15
015 **	541	465	85.95	564	504	89.36	558	470	84.23	3.41	-5.13
016	735	672	91.43	740	662	89.46	756	684	90.48	-1.97	1.02
017	323	272	84.21	392	336	85.71	440	372	84.55	1.50	-1.17
018	1251	942	75.30	1236	901	72.90	1127	805	71.43	-2.40	-1.47
019	483	439	90.89	484	438	90.50	491	433	88.19	-0.39	-2.31
020	939	842	89.67	951	848	89.17	1007	880	87.39	-0.50	-1.78
TOTAL (N=20)	13007	11306	86.92	12873	11117	86.36	12842	10852	84.50	-0.56	-1.86

** INDICATES R.S.P SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS (1986-1987)

*A MINUS SIGN (-) INDICATES A DECLINE IN AVERAGE DAILY ATTTENDANCE

PRIORITY ONE SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS 1987

School	April 1987		
	ANR	ADA	%ADA
021	796	692	86.9
022	510	445	87.3
023	614	538	87.6
024	314	269	85.7
025	468	432	92.3
026	475	415	87.4
TOTAL (N=6)	3177	2791	87.9

TOTAL (ALL SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS) 1987

(N=11)	6304	5451	86.5

CODES

ANR - AVERAGE NUMBER ON ROLL
ADA - AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE

RSPADA 10/5/87 PC 37 \rs

Research Question Five: Have the student suspension rates declined at the RSP and Schoolwide Project sites?

Trends

(Based on Table 4, below)

- Consistent with the School District trend, suspension rates at the RS and Schoolwide Project schools increased slightly from 1985-86 to 1986-87.

- The RSP suspension rates were slightly higher than the overall School District rates at comparable grade levels. The Priority I Schoolwide Project rates were nearly equal to the District's rates.

(Note: The increased suspension rates from 1985-86 to 1986-87 may be a factor of improved reporting. In 1985-86, 83 schools representing 123 missing school months did not submit data-- a 95.1% District response rate; in 1986-87, 29 schools representing 37 school months did not submit data -- a 98.5% District response rate. The percentages are based on the number of students suspended, divided by the applicable total number of students.)

TABLE 4.

STUDENT SUSPENSIONS (IN PERCENTAGES)

1985-1986 & 1986-1987

	1985-1986	1986-1987	% CHANGE
RSP ELEM SCHOOLS (N=18)	8.0	14.8	+ 6.8
SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS ELEM SCHOOLS (N=11)	7.6	9.0	+ 1.4
SCHOOL DISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS GRADES 1-6	7.5	9.4	+ 1.9
RSP J.H. SCHOOLS (N=2)	45.0	48.2	+ 3.2
SCHOOL DISTRICT J.H. SCHOOLS	40.3	47.3	+ 7.0
SYSTEMWIDE TOTALS	13.9	14.4	+ 0.5

Research Question Six: Are student withdrawals being reduced at the RSP schools?

Trends

(Based on Table 5, below)

- Student withdrawals were reduced at eight of the 20 RSP schools between the school years 1984-85 and 1985-86.
- The overall percentage change of student withdrawals from 1984-85 to 1985-86 was 0.6% for the RSP schools. This percentage change was slightly less than the overall School District's percentage change for the same period.

Table 5.

STUDENT WITHDRAWALS
REPLICATING SUCCESS PROGRAM 1984-1985

	WITHDRAWALS				CHANGE	
	1984-1985		1985-1986		1984-1986	
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
001	31	4.2	33	4.7	2	0.5
002	30	4.7	17	2.8	-13	-1.9
003	58	9.2	67	12.5	9	3.3
004	40	6.1	21	3.3	-19	-2.8
005	28	7.5	16	4.4	-12	-3.1
006	23	5.1	39	9.2	16	4.1
007	19	4.0	24	5.6	5	1.6
008	22	3.8	13	2.5	-9	-1.3
009	21	2.9	59	8.3	38	5.4
010	15	3.5	10	2.6	-5	-0.9
011	15	2.1	33	4.3	18	2.2
012	25	3.1	12	1.5	-13	-1.6
013	41	6.1	50	8.1	9	2.0
014	51	5.9	88	12.6	37	6.7
015	23	4.2	12	2.1	-11	-2.1
016	31	4.4	37	5.4	6	1.0
017	22	8.0	9	2.7	-13	-5.3
018	90	6.8	96	8.4	6	1.6
019	23	4.6	27	5.9	4	1.3
020	90	8.8	93	9.6	3	0.8
MEAN	35	5.3	38	5.8	3	0.6
SYSTEMWIDE TOTAL	32,007	14.9	32,382	15.7	375	0.8

(The Schoolwide Projects were implemented in 1986-1987.)

Research Question Seven: Has there been a reduction in the student turnover rates for RS and Schoolwide Project sites?

Trends

(Based on Table 6, attached)

- In 12 of the 20 RSP schools there was a reduction in the student turnover rates for the school years 1984-85 to 1985-86, and 1985-86 to 1986-87.
- At two of the 12 schools which showed improvements, there was a reduction in student turnover rates for consecutive years.
- The overall student turnover rate for the 20 RSP schools went from an increase (+ 0.7%) between the years 1984-85 and 1985-86, to a decrease (-0.3) between the years 1985-86 and 1986-87.

Schoolwide Projects

- Three of the six Priority 1 Schoolwide Projects showed a reduction in the student turnover rate.
- The 11 Schoolwide Projects showed a reduction of 0.7% in the student turnover rate for the years 1985-86 and 1986-87.

Table 6.

STUDENT TURNOVER RATES (April Profiles)
REPLICATING SUCCESS SCHOOLS, 1984-1987

School		ADMITS 84-85	ADMITS 85-86	ADMITS 86-87	DISMISSALS 84-85	DISMISSALS 85-86	DISMISSALS 86-87	Enrollment 84-85	Enrollment 85-86	Enrollment 86-87	TURNOVER RATE 84-85	TURNOVER RATE 85-86	TURNOVER RATE 86-87	% CHANGE 1984-86	% CHANGE 1985-87
001		10	12	4	11	12	10	716	702	742	2.9	3.4	1.9	0.5	-1.5
002		3	13	10	9	10	8	681	694	701	1.8	3.3	2.6	1.6	-0.7
003		13	16	10	13	13	15	568	522	493	4.6	5.6	5.1	1.0	-0.5
004		11	15	14	9	14	18	643	654	646	3.1	4.4	5.0	1.3	0.5
005		3	6	4	9	0	2	342	353	407	3.5	1.7	1.5	-1.8	-0.2
006	##	5	10	3	11	6	9	432	407	392	3.7	3.9	3.1	0.2	-0.9
007		6	8	7	2	4	7	439	434	371	1.8	2.8	3.8	0.9	1.0
008	##	11	15	3	5	15	6	600	579	639	2.7	5.2	1.4	2.5	-3.8
009		18	15	10	12	15	11	783	780	776	3.8	3.8	2.7	.0	-1.1
010		8	7	5	5	2	2	405	392	380	3.2	2.3	1.8	-0.9	-0.5
011	##	8	11	13	7	16	12	780	793	784	1.9	3.4	3.2	1.5	-0.2
012	##	14	12	18	8	10	9	779	782	754	2.8	2.8	3.6	.0	0.8
013		4	9	8	12	10	8	610	586	558	2.6	3.2	2.9	0.6	-0.4
014		14	14	21	11	19	6	793	828	820	3.2	4.0	3.3	0.8	-0.7
015	##	9	15	16	7	15	14	541	564	558	3.0	5.3	5.4	2.4	0.1
016		5	16	20	10	11	21	735	740	756	2.0	3.6	5.4	1.6	1.8
017		1	9	15	15	9	12	323	392	440	5.0	4.6	6.1	-0.4	1.5
018		28	36	24	26	39	44	942	1235	1114	5.7	6.1	6.1	0.3	.0
019		4	14	9	9	13	10	483	484	491	2.7	5.6	3.9	2.9	-1.7
020		20	11	15	18	17	23	939	951	1007	4.0	2.9	3.8	-1.1	0.8
Total (n=20)		195	264	229	209	250	247	12534	12872	12829	3.2	3.9	3.6	0.7	-0.3

INDICATES R.S.P. SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS (1986-1987)

PRIORITY 1 SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS 1987
(n=6)

School	ADMITS 85-86	ADMITS 86-87	DISMISSALS 85-86	DISMISSALS 86-87	ENR. 85-86	ENR. 86-87	TURNOVER 85-86	TURNOVER 86-87	% CHANGE 1985-87
021	13	12	6	16	779	796	2.4	3.5	1.1
022	4	7	4	4	478	510	1.7	2.2	0.5
023	13	7	12	10	622	614	4.0	2.8	-1.3
024	15	14	9	5	302	314	7.9	6.1	-1.9
025	17	21	11	22	467	468	6.0	9.2	3.2
026	28	15	21	16	455	475	10.8	6.5	-4.2
Total	90	76	63	73	3103	3177	5.5	5.0	-0.4
Totals (all Schoolwide Projects) (n=11)	132	1932	80	86	3103	3177	4.4	3.6	-0.7

RSPst6 10/6/87 PC37 \rs

Research Question Eight: Are the chief administrators for the RS and Schoolwide Projects experienced, i.e., do they have extensive administrative experience as school principals?

Trends

(Based on Table 7, attached)

- The majority of principals at the RSP schools have at least five years of experience as administrators.
- The average number of years that RSP principals have served at RSP schools is 6.6 years; the average number of years RSP principals have served as administrators in the School District is 10.7 years.

Schoolwide Projects

- The administrators in the six Priority 1 Schoolwide Project sites have an average of 1.7 years of experience at their schools, and an average of 8.3 years in the District.

Table 7.

PRINCIPALS LENGTH of SERVICE
REPLICATING SUCCESS SCHOOLS, 1987

School	Number of Years IN SCHOOL	IN SYSTEM
001	1	14
002	5	15
003	7	7
004	5	15
005	2	2
006 **	10	21
007	3	4
008 **	1	4
009	14	16
010	8	9
011 **	11	15
012 **	18	24
013	5	15
014	6	9
015 **	1	1
016	5	9
017	16	16
018	5	9
019	4	4
020	4	4
Mean Total (n=20)	6.6	10.7

** INDICATES R.S.P. SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS (1986-1987)

PRIORITY 1 SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS 1987
(n=6)

School	Number of Years IN SCHOOL	IN SYSTEM
021	1	2
022	4	13
023	1	6
024	1	19
025	1	1
026	2	9
Total	1.7	8.3

Mean Totals (all Schoolwide Projects)
(n=11) 4.6* 11.8*

*(Note:Cases 006,011,and 012 skew the mean scores for Schoolwide Projects. Principals in the majority of Schoolwide Projects are new to the schools and relatively new to the system as principals.)

Research Question Nine: Did student award assemblies, and other recognition of students' achievements occur at RS and Schoolwide Project sites?

Trends

- Based on interviews and observations conducted by program evaluators, all 26 schools in the RS and Priority 1 Schoolwide Projects regularly held student award assemblies. In addition, student of the month awards, and other recognition awards were consistently held for students at all the schools. (Information from students concerning their views on awards and recognition was not collected, but will be considered in future evaluations.)

Research Question Ten: What is the perception of RS and Schoolwide Project school principals, central office personnel assigned to work at the schools, and School Improvement Council (SIC) chairpersons at the schools, on improvement(s) in the school climate?

Trends

- At 23 of the 26 schools, principals, central office staff, and SIC chairpersons were interviewed by program evaluators. At 17 of the 23 schools it was perceived by principals, central office staff and SIC chairpersons, that there was an improvement in the school climate.

Implications of Findings

The analysis of the multiple indicators of school climate in the Replicating Success Program leads to the following question: Is the project working, i.e., effective, in regards to improved school climate at individual schools and the overall project?

The data trends indicate that while a worsening of school climate in the RSP is not a dominant feature (as it may have been without the program), no claims of improvement in the overall project can be determined from the data at this time.

The survey data, i.e., perceptions of a variety of school district personnel, suggest that individuals at 75% of the schools perceive improvement in their respective school climate. The survey data suggest a different picture from the quantitative data tables. Consistent with research and evaluation on school improvement, staff perceptions generally are more positive than indicated by quantitative results (Bloom, 1987; Coladarci & Donaldson, 1987; Pugh, 1986; Stavros & Moore, 1985). The implication of such a contradiction in the findings is that individuals' perceptions, expectations and belief systems (ways of viewing improvements) are concretized prior to physical evidence, i.e., quantitative results (Gottfredson & Gottfredson, 1987).

In summation, Is the project working? Relatedly, has school climate improved? Staff involved in the RSP indicate an affirmative view while the data from multiple indicators suggest otherwise.

An overriding question that develops from this evaluation may be: Has the RSP been successfully implemented?

The abridged literature review on school improvement programs, which was included in the previous evaluation of the RSP school climate component, suggested that a minimum of five years was necessary to begin to answer conclusively the question of project implementation (Pugh, 1986). On the basis of the data trends which are documented in this study, the following conclusion could be made: the RSP has not, as of yet, become effective to a point of producing consistent improvements in school climate.

The findings in this evaluation were presented using the chart essay format, i.e., linking specific research questions to policy decisions, while arranging the answer to each question in a chart that highlights research data gathered in the field (Haensly, Lupkowski, & McNamara, 1987). The presentation of the data in such a format attempted to address the issue of evaluation utilization via improving the quality of information available to decisionmakers (see, e.g., Chelinsky, 1987). Although the finding do not indicate the success of the School District's project, the objective information was communicated in a way that provided policymakers with practical and relevant data.

Policy Recommendations

In consideration of the data trends and the implications previously discussed, the following list of policy recommendations have emerged:

(1) The RSP must continue to emphasize and develop school-based leadership.

At individual schools and within the overall project, leadership must be developed among principals and teachers. The in school low tenure rates (Table 7) for many of the principals, especially the majority in Schoolwide Project sites, and the increasing numbers of teachers new to the schools and/or new to the system suggest the importance of school-based leadership training. This study along with previous evaluations on school climate, and academic progress within RSP schools should be presented to all project participants. School personnel must be able to meet and discuss these and other evaluation findings. As part of the school improvement planning process specific strategies are needed, that generate at the school level, which attempt to address issues raised concerning the lack of improvement (Coladarci & Donaldson, 1987; Gottfredson & Gottfredson, 1987; Rosenholtz,1985).

(2) The involvement of the central office-research/evaluation personnel and curriculum staff, along with district office support needs to continue and possibly expand.

Consistent with the tenets that underlie school effectiveness and school improvement programs, the role of the central and district offices is paramount (Cox, 1983; Huberman, 1983).

The important issue related to central and district offices support for programs is the expanded and well-defined roles of staff. A well-coordinated and clearly defined involvement of central and district offices' personnel who recognize the school-based leadership potential of teachers and principals requires staff development efforts at the school, central, and district office levels.

(3) After three years of administrative changes at the management and executive levels of the program, long-range administrative stability is imperative.

In evaluative studies on project implementation it is recognized that the occurrence of "executive shifts", i.e., upper level mangement changes, have the impact of limiting the continuity of a project. As a result, implementation becomes potentially more difficult. Also, questions of "commitment" and upper level support may develop within the perspective of those at the school level. The necessity of communicating, as well as limiting management changes must be considered as a factor affecting a project's success (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Cohen, 1987; Frechtling, 1987; Freiberg, 1987).

(4) The Schoolwide Projects emphasis should be expanded to other schools within the program.

This study did not focus on individual schools, but the data does suggest that the schools identified as Priority 1 Schoolwide Projects tended to show greater quantitative improvements on the multiple indicators of school climate than schools not identified as Schoolwide Projects. The issue of regulatory reforms (a chief initiative of the District's Superintendent) is potentially the only means of accomplishing this recommendation. However, recent research and evaluation of Schoolwide Projects in the Austin, Texas Public Schools suggest Schoolwide Projects may not be as effective as Chapter 1 (Christner, 1987).

(5) Recognition of "pockets of excellence" within the Priority 1/ Replicating Success Program.

One of the chief reoccurring themes in the research literature on school effectiveness/school improvement programs is the view that in spite of preliminary program results, based on test scores and other quantitative indicators which suggest limited overall program improvements, within school excellence is evident at some grade levels and/or within individual classrooms (Frechtling, 1987; Freiberg, 1987; Mandeville, 1987; Stringfield, 1987). A detailed analysis of the multiple indicators of school climate in the Priority 1/RSP suggests that at some schools, and within grades at schools, improvements are a reality.

The policy implication concerning "pockets of excellence" is that administrators need to build-on and expand exemplary practices. The lead or master teacher concept, and increased staff development (both within and across schools) for teachers and principals are imperative (Griffin, 1986).

This evaluation does not conclude that dramatic or clearly evident improvements in the Priority 1/RSP have occurred. It does, however, suggest that the data trends indicate "pockets of improvement" within the program, as well as individual school progress. For example, individuals' perceptions which were based on within school assessments indicated improvements were in a formative stage, as well as in isolated classroom/school settings; four project schools showed consistent improvements in staff attendance over a three year period; student withdrawals were reduced at eight RSP schools; at two project sites student turnover rates were reduced for consecutive years; and finally, Schoolwide Project sites seemed to indicate a greater potential for improvement than non-Schoolwide Projects.

References

Berman, P. & McLaughlin, M. (1978). Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. VII: Implementing and sustaining innovations. Santa Monica, Ca.: Rand Corp.

Bloom, P. (1987). A comparison of teacher and administrator perceptions of organizational climate in the early childhood setting. Paper presented at American Educational Research Association (AERA), Washington, D.C.

Chelinsky, E. (Fall, 1987). What have we learned about the politics of program evaluation? Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, Vol. 9, No. 3, PP. 199-213.

Christner, C. (1987). Schoolwide Projects: The almost revolution(?) six years later. Paper presented at AERA, Washington, D.C.

Cohen, M. (1987). Teacher leadership and collaboration: Key concepts and issues in school change. Paper presented at AERA, Washington, D.C.

Coladarci, T. & Donaldson, Jr., (1987). Using school climate assessments: An approach to collaborative school improvement. Paper presented at AERA, Washington, D.C.

Cox, P. (November, 1983). Complementary roles in successful change. Educational Leadership, pp.10-14.

Frechtling, J. (1987). A school district perspective: Questions that aren't being asked. Paper presented at AERA, Washington, D.C.

Freiberg, H. J. (1987). A classroom process researcher's views of school effectiveness research. Paper presented at AERA, Washington, D.C.

Gottfredson, G. & Gottfredson, D. (1987). Using organization development to improve school climate. Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools. John Hopkins Univ., Report No. 87. Paper presented at AERA, Washington, D.C.

Griffin, G. (1985). Master teachers and the school as workplace. The Elementary School Journal, Vol. LXXXVI, pp. 1-16.

Haensly, A., Lupkowski, A., McNamara, J. (Spring, 1987). The chart essay: A strategy for communicating research findings to policymakers and practitioners. Education Evaluation/Policy Analysis, Vol. 9, No. 1, PP.63-75.

Huberman, M. (November, 1983). School improvement strategies that work. Educational Leadership. Vol. 41., No. 3, pp. 23-27.

Mason-Dorman, C. (1987). Graduates, dropouts and withdrawls, 1985-1986. School District of Philadelphia, Office of Research and Evaluation, Report No. 8722.

Mason-Dorman, C. (1986-1987). Superintendent's management information center. School District of Philadelphia, Reports No. 8626 & 8711.

Pugh, W. (1985). Replicating success project evaluation-survey of principals, school improvement council chairpersons and academic facilitators. School District of Philadelphia, Office of Research and Evaluation, Report No. 8606.

Pugh, W. (1986). An evaluation of the replicating success project: School climate component. School District of Philadelphia, Office of Research and and Evaluation Report No. 8714.

Rosenholtz, S. (1985). Effective schools: Interpreting the evidence. American Journal of Education. Vol. 93, No. 3, pp. 352-388.

Stavros, D. & Moore, J. (1985). Two perspectives on school climate: Do staff and students see a school the same way? Paper presented at AERA, Chicago, Il.

Stringfield, S. & Tedlie, C. (1987). A time to summarize: Six years and three phases of the Louisiana school effectiveness study. Paper presented at AERA, Washington, D.C.

Appendix A: Absence Rates For Teachers and Para-Professionals

APPENDIX A

REPLICATING SUCCESS SCHOOLS, 1985-1987

ABSENCE RATES FOR TEACHERS AND PARAPROFESSIONALS

School -PID	STAFF ABSENCES 1985 No. Emp.	1985 P.I.	1985 IPI	1986 No. Emp.	1986 P.I.	1986 IPI	1987 No. Emp.	1987 P.I.	1987 IPI
001									
E02	12	309.5	11.9	12	88.0	3.4	12	188	7.3
E97	7	102.0	6.7	8	113.0	6.5	8	62	3.6
T02	39	487.0	5.8	40	285.0	3.3	44	384.5	4.0
Total	58	898.5		60	486.0		64	634.5	
002									
E02	8	83.5	4.6	6	86.0	5.0	8	92	5.3
E97	6	76.0	5.9	5	181.0	16.8	6	77	5.9
T02	33	301.0	4.2	31	437.5	6.5	31	273.5	4.1
Total	47	460.5		44	704.5		45	442.5	
003									
E02	6	66.0	5.1	5	127.0	11.8	6	203	15.7
E97	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
T02	42	504.0	5.6	38	470.0	5.7	39	371	4.4
Total	48	570.0		43	597.0		45	574.0	
004									
E02	14	142.0	4.7	15	268.5	8.3	16	236.5	6.8
E97	7	77.0	5.1	7	141.0	9.3	8	135	7.8
T02	36	308.0	4.0	35	319.5	4.2	40	461.5	5.3
Total	57	527.0		57	729.0		64	833.0	
005									
E02	3	142.0	21.9	3	20.5	3.2	4	36	4.2
E97	5	77.0	7.1	5	45.0	4.2	5	57	5.3
T02	25	308.5	5.7	23	181.5	3.7	26	5	0.1
Total	33	527.5		31	247.0		35	98.0	
006 ‡‡									
E02	8	186.5	10.8	7	58.0	3.8	8	65	3.8
E97	3	22.0	3.4	2	65.0	15.0	4	39	4.5
T02	21	141.5	3.1	23	193.0	3.9	25	200.5	3.7
Total	32	350.0		32	316.0		37	304.5	
007									
E02	13	194.5	6.9	13	252.5	9.0	11	184.5	7.8
E97	3	129.0	19.9	2	9.0	2.1	3	26	4.0
T02	33	263.0	3.7	32	424.5	6.1	31	344.5	5.1
Total	49	586.5		47	686.0		45	555.0	
008 ‡‡									
E02	10	89.5	4.1	11	91.0	3.8	11	111	4.7
E97	5	58.0	5.4	4	204.0	23.6	4	92	10.6
T02	27	219.0	3.8	24	176.5	3.4	30	242.5	3.7
Total	42	366.5		39	471.5		45	445.5	

APPENDIX A

REPLICATING SUCCESS SCHOOLS, 1985-1987

ABSENCE RATES FOR TEACHERS AND PARAPROFESSIONALS

STAFF ABSENCES

School -PID	1985 No. Emp.	1985 P.I.	1985 IPI	1986 No. Emp.	1986 P.I.	1986 IPI	1987 No. Emp.	1987 P.I.	1987 IPI
009									
E02	12	188.5	7.3	15	146.5	4.5	17	382.5	10.4
E97	6	38.0	2.9	6	45.0	3.5	6	68	5.2
T02	33	258.0	3.6	34	224.5	3.1	37	458.5	5.7
Total	51	484.5		55	416.0		60	909.0	
010									
E02	11	66.0	3.6	12	164.0	7.1	9	63.5	3.3
E97	5	11.0	1.0	5	24.0	2.2	5	22	2.0
T02	24	334.0	6.4	25	194.5	3.6	22	152	3.2
Total	40	431.0		42	402.5		36	237.5	
011 **									
E02	13	172.5	6.1	14	176.0	5.9	14	456	15.1
E97	6	130.0	10.0	5	31.0	2.9	11	109	4.6
T02	37	545.0	6.6	36	593.5	7.6	40	610	7.1
Total	56	847.5		55	802.5		65	1175.0	
012 **									
E02	15	118.0	3.6	14	120.5	4.0	16	386.5	11.2
E97	6	39.0	3.0	6	94.0	7.3	5	120	11.1
T02	34	512.0	7.0	34	436.0	5.9	40	310	3.6
Total	55	669.0		54	650.5		61	816.5	
013									
E02	12	116.0	4.5	13	156.5	5.6	14	97.5	3.2
E97	7	152.0	10.1	7	53.0	3.5	7	54	3.6
T02	35	252.0	3.3	34	230.0	3.1	37	233	2.9
Total	54	520.0		54	439.5		58	384.5	
014									
E02	16	234.5	6.8	16	314.0	9.1	17	267	7.8
E97	7	53.0	3.5	6	66.0	5.1	7	72	4.8
T02	40	418.5	4.6	43	370.5	4.0	46	334	3.4
Total	63	706.0		65	750.5		70	693.0	
015 **									
E02	10	88.0	4.1	9	66.0	3.4	10	74.5	3.4
E97	3	27.0	4.2	3	36.0	5.6	0	0	0.0
T02	25	266.0	4.9	26	382.0	6.8	32	433	6.3
Total	38	381.0		38	484.0		42	507.5	
016									
E02	10	115.0	5.3	12	233.5	9.0	11	194	8.2
E97	3	27.0	4.2	3	34.0	5.2	4	36	4.2
T02	30	306.0	4.7	32	235.0	3.4	35	432	5.7
Total	43	448.0		47	502.5		50	662.0	

APPENDIX A

REPLICATING SUCCESS SCHOOLS, 1985-1987

ABSENCE RATES FOR TEACHERS AND PARAPROFESSIONALS

STAFF ABSENCES

School -PID	1985 No. Emp.	1985 P.I.	1985 %PI	1986 No. Emp.	1986 P.I.	1986 %PI	1987 No. Emp.	1987 P.I.	1987 %PI
017									
E02	7	113.5	7.5	8	38.0	2.2	11	71.5	3.0
E97	4	24.0	2.8	3	33.0	5.1	7	30	2.0
T02	15	110.5	3.4	17	207.0	5.6	35	298.5	3.9
Total	26	248.0		28	278.0		53	400.0	
018									
E02	13	111.5	4.0	13	151.5	5.4	12	114.5	4.4
E97	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
T02	77	897.0	5.4	68	790.5	5.4	7	1056.5	69.9
Total	90	1008.5		81	942.0		19	1171.0	
019									
E02	4	14.0	1.6	4	21.5	2.5	4	31	3.6
E97	5	146.0	13.5	4	45.0	5.2	4	132	15.3
T02	22	283.0	5.5	22	150.0	3.2	25	475.5	8.8
Total	31	423.0		30	216.5		33	638.5	
020									
E02	5	27.5	2.5	5	33.0	3.1	6	35.5	2.7
E97	9	66.0	3.4	9	82.0	4.2	10	96	4.4
T02	42	218.5	2.4	40	250.0	2.9	43	367.5	4.0
Total	56	312.0		54	365.0		59	499.0	
20 schools	1838	20906.0	5.3	1816	20290.0	5.2	1860	22990.0	5.7
E02	202	2598.5	6.0	209	2634.5	5.8	217	3310.0	7.1
E97	97	1254.0	6.0	90	1301.0	6.7	104	1227.0	5.5
T02	670	6912.5	4.8	657	6551.0	4.6	665	7443.5	5.2

‡‡ INDICATES R.S.P. SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS (1986-1987)

PRIORITY 1 SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS
1987

School -PID	No. Emp.	P.I.	%PI
021			
E02	9	65.0	3.3
E97	5	39.0	3.6
T02	37	200.5	2.5
Total	51	304.5	
022			
E02	11	119.0	5.0
E97	5	37.0	3.4
T02	23	185.5	3.7
Total	39	341.5	
023			
E02	10	87.0	4.0
E97	7	53.0	3.5
T02	33	204.5	2.9
Total	50	344.5	
024			
E02	10	33.0	1.5
E97	3	5.0	0.8
T02	18	159.5	4.1
Total	31	197.5	
025			
E02	7	63.0	4.2
E97	3	43.0	6.6
T02	25	167.0	3.1
Total	35	273.0	
026			
E02	11	55.5	2.3
E97	7	114.0	7.5
T02	35	236.5	3.1
Total	53	406.0	
06 schools	412	2922.0	3.3
E02	58	422.5	3.4
E97	30	291.0	4.5
T02	171	1153.5	3.1

Personnel Identification (PID) Codes:

E02 Paraprofessional, full time, 10 months
E97 Reading Aides, 10 months
T02 Teachers, full time, 10 months
P.I. Personal Illness

RSPSTAB 10/1/87 pc 37 \rs